



OFFICE of the ATTORNEY GENERAL  
GREG ABBOTT

January 14, 2003

Mr. Steven D. Monté  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Dallas  
2014 Main Street, Room 501  
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2003-0274

Dear Mr. Monté:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 177502.

The Dallas Police Department (the "Department") received a request for all offense and police reports pertaining to a named individual at a certain address. The requestor specifically requested offense report numbers 0029862-A, 0035905-A, and 00823320-Z. A notation on the open records request form indicates the Department possesses no arrest records. You assert that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have reviewed the information you submitted and considered the exception you claim.

Initially, we note that you did not submit information responsive to offense report numbers 0035905-A and 00823320-Z. We assume the Department has released these reports to the requestor. However, if the Department has not released these or any other responsive documents not submitted to this office for review, it must do so at this time. *See Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .302.*

Further, we note that you did not meet your burden under section 552.301 of the Government Code with respect to the request for information. Subsections 552.301(a) and (b) provide:

- (a) A governmental body that receives a written request for information that it wishes to withhold from public disclosure and that it considers to be within

one of the [act's] exceptions . . . must ask for a decision from the attorney general about whether the information is within that exception if there has not been a previous determination about whether the information falls within one of the exceptions.

(b) The governmental body must ask for the attorney general's decision and state the exceptions that apply within a reasonable time but not later than the 10th business day after the date of receiving the written request.

In this case, the Department received a written request for information on December 4, 2002 as evidenced by both your acknowledgment in your letter to this office and the date stamped on the request from the requestor. You should have submitted your request for an attorney general opinion no later than December 18, 2002. The Department did not request a decision from this office until December 30, 2002. Consequently, we conclude that by submitting an untimely request for a decision from this office, the Department failed to comply with § 552.301(b) of the Government Code.

According to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the information is public and must be released. Information that is presumed public must be released unless a governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information to overcome this presumption. *See Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.--Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). Normally, a compelling interest is that some other source of law makes the information confidential or that third party interests are at stake. Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). Because the application of section 552.101 of the Government Code qualifies as a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness, we will address your argument for withholding this information despite your failure to comply with section 552.301(b).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Section 552.101 incorporates the doctrine of common-law privacy. Information is protected under the common-law right to privacy when (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *See Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). The type of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683. This office has determined that common-law privacy protects the following

information: the kinds of prescription drugs a person is taking, *see* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987); the results of mandatory urine testing, *see id.*; illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps of applicants, *see id.*; the fact that a person attempted suicide, *see* Open Records Decision No. 422 (1984); and information regarding drug overdoses, acute alcohol intoxication, obstetrical/gynecological illnesses, convulsions/seizures, or emotional/mental distress, *see* Open Records Decision No. 343 (1982). The submitted documents contain such intimate information that is not of legitimate concern to the public. Accordingly, the Department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Christen Sorrell".

Christen Sorrell  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CHS/seg

Ref: ID# 177502

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Harold Arowesty  
6527 Westgate Drive  
Dallas, Texas 75240  
(w/o enclosures)